



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/550,583	09/22/2005	Hiroki Hashi	S1459.70084US00	1383
23628 7590 07/17/2009 WOLF GREENFIELD & SACKS, P.C. 600 ATLANTIC AVENUE BOSTON, MA 02210-2206				
EXAMINER				
LEE IV, THOMAS E				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2447				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
07/17/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/550,583

Applicant(s)

HASHI, HIROKI

Examiner

THOMAS LEE

Art Unit

2447

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 June 2009.
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 22 September 2005 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-8508)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. The applicant amended claims 1 and 5 in the amendment filed on 1 June 2009.
Claims 1-11 are pending.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-11 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 5-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Allmond et al. (US Patent 6,072,803 A).

With regards to claim 5, Allmond teaches an electronic apparatus comprising a connector jack for connection of a network Cable (column 6, line 30-31 and figure 1, items 110 and 112); an access controller for detecting an electrical connection or disconnection (i.e., the NIC detects the pulses at the receivers, including disconnection, column 6, line 36-39 and column 8, line 51-55) between the network cable and said connector jack by detecting an availability of a digital signal (i.e., pulses are detected at the receivers of the NIC from the network via a connector plug, column 6, line 29-35 and

column 7, line 38-40) at a receiving contact of the connector jack (i.e., the pulses are received via the connection to the network, teaching at a receiving contact of a connector jack, column 6, line 29-35), the digital signal being received from a network (i.e., the pulses are from the network device, teaching network, column 6, line 35-46); and a micro-computer (figure 1, item 107) wherein a detection output of said access controller is supplied as an interrupt signal to said micro-computer (i.e., the NIC can communicate with the CPU via an interrupts when asserting signals, column 6, line 20-28) in response to detecting the availability of the digital signal (i.e., when detecting the pulses, the NIC asserts the link signal, column 7, line 40-45), and upon detection of the interrupt signal, said micro-computer executes processing for connection or disconnection of said network cable (i.e., from any event, the CPU executes a driver or software routine to control the MAC to establish communications, thus processing connection or disconnection, column 6, line 26-28).

With regards to claim 6, Allmond teaches when an access controller has detected the connection of said network cable (i.e., the NIC asserts a link signal when pulses from a network connection are detected, column 7, line 36-45), said micro-computer detects a link to said network (i.e., the CPU detects the connection via a link signal, column 7, line 36-45), and when said micro-computer detects said link to said network, said micro-computer executes the processing for accessing the network (i.e., the CPU executes a driver or software processes to control the MAC to establish communication, column 6, line 25-28).

With regards to claim 7, Allmond teaches when an access controller has detected the disconnection of said network cable, the micro-computer executes the processing of not allowing the use of said network (i.e., the CPU executes a driver or software processes to control the MAC to establish communication, including disabling transceivers, teaching not allowing use of the network, column 6, line 25-28 and column 6, line 51-column 7, line 5).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1-4 and 8-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Allmond et al. (US Patent 6,072,803 A) in view of Haatainen et al. (US Patent 6,678,734 B1).

With regards to claim 1, Allmond teaches a method for supervising a connection to a network of an electronic apparatus including an access controller for detecting an electrical connection or disconnection of a network cable, and a micro-computer (i.e., via software that can be loaded onto the CPU or Network Interface Card (NIC), the NIC can detect the connection or disconnection of the network device, or network, and provide an interrupt to identify the connection or disconnection to the CPU, column 6, line 20-28 and column 7, line 57-column 8, line 17), the method comprising detecting an

availability of a digital signal (i.e., pulses are detected at the receivers of the NIC, column 7, line 38-40) at a receiving contact of a connector jack of the electronic apparatus (i.e., the pulses are received via the connection to the network, teaching at a receiving contact of a connector jack, column 6, line 29-35), the digital signal being received from the network (i.e., the pulses are from the network device, teaching network, column 6, line 35-46); supplying, in response to detecting the availability of the digital signal (i.e., when detecting the pulses, the NIC asserts the link signal, column 7, line 40-45), a detection output of said access controller as an interrupt signal to said micro-computer (i.e., the NIC can communicate with the CPU via an interrupts when asserting signals, column 6, line 20-28); and executing by the micro-computer, processing for connection or disconnection of said network cable in response to receiving the interrupt signal (i.e., from any event, the CPU executes a driver or software routine to control the MAC to establish communications, thus processing connection or disconnection, column 6, line 26-28). Allmond does not explicitly disclose a micro-computer comprising a non-event-driven type operating system. However, Haatainen teaches an OS in said micro-computer is a non-event-driven OS [i.e., LINUX] (i.e., the CPU architecture utilizes the OS kernel, which may be Linux, column 7, lines 1-4 and column 13, lines 58-61), in order to provide additional functionality to operating systems by redirecting code for supporting additional services (Haatainen, column 1, lines 62-66 and column 7, line 1-10). Therefore, based on Allmond in view of Haatainen, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teachings of Haatainen to the system of Allmond in

order to provide additional functionality to operating systems by redirecting code for supporting additional services.

With regards to claim 2, Allmond teaches when an access controller detects the connection of said network cable (i.e., the NIC asserts a link signal when pulses from a network connection are detected, column 7, line 36-45), said micro-computer detects a link to said network (i.e., the CPU detects the connection via a link signal, column 7, line 36-45), and when said micro-computer detects said the link to said network, said micro-computer executes processing for accessing the network (i.e., the CPU executes a driver or software processes to control the MAC to establish communication, column 6, line 25-28).

With regards to claim 3, Allmond teaches when said access controller has detected the disconnection of said network cable, said micro-computer executes processing for not allowing use of said network (i.e., the CPU executes a driver or software processes to control the MAC to establish communication, including disabling transceivers, teaching not allowing use of the network, column 6, line 25-28 and column 6, line 51-column 7, line 5).

With respect to claim 4, Allmond teaches when said network cable is connected, use of said network is enabled through said network cable (i.e., the network pulses are detected from the connection and communications established, column 3, line 57-66).

With regards to claim 8, Allmond teaches an electronics apparatus wherein when the network cable is connected to the connector jack, the use of the network is enabled through said network (i.e., the network pulses are detected from the connection and

communications established, column 3, line 57-66). Allmond does not specifically teach an operating system in said micro-computer is a non-event-driven type OS. However, Haatainen teaches an OS in said micro-computer is a non-event-driven OS [i.e., LINUX] (i.e., the CPU architecture utilizes the OS kernel, which may be Linux, column 7, lines 1-4 and column 13, lines 58-61), in order to provide additional functionality to operating systems by redirecting code for supporting additional services (Haatainen, column 1, lines 62-66 and column 7, line 1-10). Therefore, based on Allmond in view of Haatainen, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teachings of Haatainen to the system of Allmond in order to provide additional functionality to operating systems by redirecting code for supporting additional services.

With respect to claim 9, Allmond teaches the subject matter disclosed above. Allmond does not explicitly disclose executing at least one hook program selected based on preset information stored in the micro-computer. However, Haatainen teaches executing at least one hook program (i.e., functions are hooked, teaching at least one hook program, column 6, line 54-60) selected based on preset information stored in the micro-computer (i.e., the operating system kernel, executed by the processor, utilizes references, teaching preset information, to perform the hooks, column 6, lines 54-64 and column 12, line 53-61). Hence, the limitations of claim 9 are rejected in the analysis of claim 1 above, and claim 9 is rejected on that basis.

With respect to claim 10, Allmond teaches directing a process for the electronic apparatus (i.e., the CPU can perform any necessary procedures or routines for

controlling the NIC, column 6, lines 16-19). Allmond does not explicitly disclose the at least one hook program and acquiring an Internet Protocol address. However, Haataien teaches the at least one hook program (i.e., functions are hooked, teaching at least one hook program, column 6, line 54-60) and acquiring an Internet Protocol address (i.e., DHCP clients can update the registry and an Address Resolution Protocol (ARP) packet can be sent, teaching acquiring an IP address, column 12, line 41-50). Hence, the limitations of claim 10 are rejected in the analysis of claim 9 above, and claim 10 is rejected on that basis.

With respect to claim 11, Allmond teaches the subject matter disclose above. Allmond does not explicitly disclose requesting an Internet Protocol address for the electronic apparatus. However, Haatainen teaches requesting an Internet Protocol address for the electronic apparatus (i.e., DHCP clients can update the registry and an Address Resolution Protocol (ARP) packet can be sent, teaching requesting an IP address, column 12, line 41-50). Hence, the limitations of claim 11 are rejected in the analysis of claims 1 and 2 above, and claim 11 is rejected on that basis.

Conclusion

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to THOMAS LEE whose telephone number is (571) 270-7292. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday, 7:30am - 5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James Hwang can be reached on (571) 272-4036. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/T.L./
Examiner, Art Unit 2447
30 June 2009

/Joon H. Hwang/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2447